arXiv:1510.00417v1 [math.CO] 1 Oct 2015

A zero-free interval for chromatic polynomials of graphs with 3-leaf spanning trees

Thomas Perrett
Department of Applied Mathematics and Computer Science,
Technical University of Denmark,
DK-2800 Lyngby, Denmark
tper@dtu.dk

October 5, 2015

Abstract

It is proved that if G is a graph containing a spanning tree with at most three leaves, then the chromatic polynomial of G has no roots in the interval $(1, t_1]$, where $t_1 \approx 1.2904$ is the smallest real root of the polynomial $(t-2)^6+4(t-1)^2(t-2)^3-(t-1)^4$. We also construct a family of graphs containing such spanning trees with chromatic roots converging to t_1 from above. We employ the Whitney 2-switch operation to manage the analysis of an infinite class of chromatic polynomials.

1 Introduction

The *chromatic polynomial* $P(G, t)$ of a graph G is a polynomial with integer coefficients which counts for each non-negative integer t, the number of t-colourings of G. It was introduced by Birkhoff [2] in 1912 for planar graphs, and extended to all graphs by Whitney [9, 10] in 1932. If t is a real number then we say t is a *chromatic root* of G if $P(G, t) = 0$. Thus the numbers $0, 1, 2, \ldots, \chi(G) - 1$ are always chromatic roots of G and, in fact, the only rational ones. On the other hand it is easy to see that $P(G, t)$ is never zero for $t \in (-\infty, 0)$ and Tutte [8] showed that the same is true for the interval $(0, 1)$. In 1993 Jackson [5] proved the surprising result that the interval $(1, 32/27]$ is also zero-free, and found a sequence of graphs whose chromatic roots converge to $32/27$ from above. Thomassen [6] strengthened this by

showing that the set of chromatic roots consists of 0, 1, and a dense subset of the interval $(32/27, \infty)$.

Let $Q(G,t) = (-1)^{|V(G)|}P(G,t)$, and $b(G)$ be the number of blocks of G. We say that G is *separable* if $b(G) \geq 2$ and *non-separable* otherwise. Note that K_2 is non-separable. In [7], Thomassen provided a new link between Hamiltonian paths and colourings by proving that the zero-free interval of Jackson can be extended when G has a Hamiltonian path. More precisely he proved the following.

Theorem 1.1. [7] *If G is a non-separable graph with a Hamiltonian path, then $Q(G,t) > 0$ for $t \in (1, t_0]$, where $t_0 \approx 1.295$ is the unique real root of the polynomial $(t-2)^3 + 4(t-1)^2$. Furthermore for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a non-separable graph with a Hamiltonian path whose chromatic polynomial has a root in the interval $(t_0, t_0 + \varepsilon)$.*

If G is separable and has a Hamiltonian path then it is easily seen using Theorem 1.1 and Proposition 2.2 that $Q(G,t)$ is non-zero in the interval $(1, t_0]$ with sign $(-1)^{b(G)-1}$.

For a graph G, a *k-leaf spanning tree* is a spanning tree of G with at most k leaves (vertices of degree 1). We denote the class of non-separable graphs which admit a k-leaf spanning tree by $\mathcal{G}_k$. Thus Theorem 1.1 gives a zero-free interval for the class $\mathcal{G}_2$. In this article we prove the following analogous result for the class $\mathcal{G}_3$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let G be a non-separable graph with a 3-leaf spanning tree, then $Q(G,t) > 0$ for $t \in (1, t_1]$, where $t_1 \approx 1.2904$ is the smallest real root of the polynomial $(t-2)^6 + 4(t-1)^2(t-2)^3 - (t-1)^4$. Furthermore for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a non-separable graph with a 3-leaf spanning tree whose chromatic polynomial has a root in the interval $(t_1, t_1 + \varepsilon)$.*

A natural extension of this work would be to find $\varepsilon_k > 0$ so that $(1, 32/27 + \varepsilon_k]$ is zero-free for the class $\mathcal{G}_k$, $k \geq 4$. However since the graphs presented by Jackson [5] are non-separable, it must be that $\varepsilon_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Another possible extension would be to find $\varepsilon_l > 0$ so that $(1, 32/27 + \varepsilon_l]$ is zero-free for the family of graphs containing a spanning tree T with $\Delta(T) \leq 3$ and at most l vertices of degree 3. Here the possible implications are much more interesting since it is not clear if $\varepsilon_l \to 0$ as $l \to \infty$. Indeed only finitely many of the graphs in [5] have a spanning tree of maximum degree 3. Theorem 1.1 and our result solve the cases $l = 0$ and $l = 1$ respectively, which leads us to conjecture the following.

Conjecture 1.1. *There exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that if G is a non-separable graph with a spanning tree of maximum degree 3, then $Q(G,t) > 0$ for $t \in (1, 32/27 + \varepsilon]$.*

Barnette [1] proved that a 3-connected planar graph has a spanning tree of maximum degree 3. Thus an affirmative answer to Conjecture 1.1 would immediately imply a zero-free interval for the class of 3-connected planar graphs. Such an interval is known [3] but thought to be far from best possible.

2 Preliminaries

All graphs in this article are *simple*, that is they have no loops or multiple edges. If uv is an edge of G then G/uv denotes the graph obtained by deleting uv and then identifying u with v. This operation is referred to as the *contraction* of uv. If G is connected, $S \subset V(G)$ and $G-S$ is disconnected, then S is called a *cut-set* of G. A 2-*cut* of G is a cut-set S with $|S| = 2$. If S is a cut-set of G and C is a component of $G - S$, then we say the graph $G[V(C) \cup S]$ is an S-*bridge* of G. If P is a path and $x, y \in V(P)$ then $P[x, y]$ denotes the subpath of P from x to y.

We make repeated use of two fundamental results in the study of chromatic polynomials.

Proposition 2.1 (Deletion-contraction identity)**.** *Let G be a graph and uv be an edge of G. Then*

$$P(G, t) = P(G - uv, t) - P(G/uv, t).$$

Proposition 2.2 (Factoring over complete subgraphs)**.** *Let $G = G_1 \cup G_2$ be a graph such that $G[V(G_1) \cap V(G_2)]$ is a complete graph on k vertices. Then*

$$P(G, t) = \frac{P(G_1, t)P(G_2, t)}{P(K_k, t)}.$$

The next proposition is easily proven using Propositions 2.1 and 2.2. The operation involved is often called a *Whitney* 2-*switch*.

Proposition 2.3. *Let G be a graph and $\{x, y\}$ be a 2-cut of G. Let C denote a connected component of $G-\{x, y\}$. Define G' to be the graph obtained from the disjoint union of $G - C$ and C by adding for all $z \in V(C)$ the edge xz (respectively yz) if and only if yz (respectively xz) is an edge of G. Then we have $P(G, t) = P(G', t)$.*

If G' can be obtained from G by a sequence of Whitney 2-switches, then $P(G, t) = P(G', t)$ and we say G and G' are *Whitney equivalent*.

Definition 2.1. *Let G be a graph. We say G has property Δ if the following conditions hold:*

- *G is non-separable but not 3-connected.*

- *For every 2-cut $\{x, y\}$, $xy \notin E(G)$ and G has precisely three $\{x, y\}$-bridges, all of which are separable.*

The property Δ characterises the class of *generalised triangles* defined by Jackson in [5]. Such graphs can be formed from a triangle by repeatedly replacing an edge by two paths of length 2.

2.1 Hamiltonian Paths

For each natural number $k \geq 1$, let H_k denote the graph obtained from a path $x_1x_2 \dots x_{2k+3}$ by adding the edges x_1x_4, $x_{2k}x_{2k+3}$, and all edges x_ix_{i+4} for $i \in \{2, 4, 6, \dots, 2k-2\}$. Also define $H_0 = K_3$ and let $\mathcal{H} = \{H_i : i \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$. In [7], Thomassen showed that if H is a smallest counterexample to Theorem 1.1, then H is isomorphic to H_k for some $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Since t_0 is taken as the infimum of the non-trivial chromatic roots of all $H_i \in \mathcal{H}$, a contradiction follows.

For fixed $t \in (1, t_0]$ the value of the chromatic polynomial of H_k at t can be expressed as

$$P(H_k, t) = A\alpha^k + B\beta^k \tag{1}$$

where A, B, α and β are constants depending on t, defined by the following relations [7].

$$\delta = \sqrt{(t-2)^4 + 4(t-1)^2(t-2)} \tag{2}$$

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{2}((t-2)^2 + \delta), \quad \beta = \frac{1}{2}((t-2)^2 - \delta) \tag{3}$$

$$A + B = t(t-1)(t-2) \tag{4}$$

$$A\alpha + B\beta = t(t-1)((t-2)^3 + (t-1)^2) \tag{5}$$

Noting that $\alpha + \beta = (t-2)^2$, we have more explicitly

$$A = \frac{1}{\delta}t(t-1)((t-2)\alpha + (t-1)^2)$$

$$B = t(t-1)(t-2) - A.$$

As stated in [7], it can be seen that for $t \in (1, t_0)$, $0 < \beta < \alpha < 1$ and $0 < B < -A < 1$. The graphs in $\mathcal{H}$ and the quantities defined above will play an important role in our result.



Figure 1: The graph $G_{4,2,3}$ and a 3-leaf spanning tree thereof.

3 A Special Class of Graphs with 3-leaf Spanning Trees

Let $F_k = H_k - x_1x_2$. If G is a graph, $\{x, y\}$ is a 2-cut of G and B is an $\{x, y\}$-bridge, then we write $B = F(x, y, k)$ to indicate that B is isomorphic to F_k, where x is identified with x_1 and y is identified with x_2 in G. For $i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, define $G_{i,j,k}$ to be the graph composed of two vertices x and y, and three $\{x, y\}$-bridges $F(x, y, i)$, $F(x, y, j)$ and $F(y, x, k)$. Figure 1 shows the graph $G_{4,2,3}$. Note that if $j = 0$, then $G_{i,j,k}$ is isomorphic to H_{i+k+2}.

Lemma 3.1 characterises particular bridges of a graph satisfying property Δ. It can be found in the work of Thomassen [7] and will be useful for us as a lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let G be a graph with property Δ, $\{x, y\}$ be a 2-cut of G and B be an $\{x, y\}$-bridge of G.*

(a) If B contains a Hamiltonian path P starting at x and ending at y, then $B = F(x, y, 0)$, i.e. B is a path of length 2.

(b) If B contains a path P starting at y and covering all vertices of B except for x, then $B = F(x, y, k)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Proof. (a) Since G has property Δ, B is separable and has a cut-vertex v. The Hamiltonian path P of B shows that neither of $G - \{x, v\}$ and $G - \{y, v\}$ can have more than two components. Thus since G has

property Δ, neither $\{x, v\}$ nor $\{y, v\}$ is a cut-set of G and so $|V(B)| = 3$. Since B is connected and $xy \notin E(G)$, B is a path of length 2 as claimed.

(b) Again B is separable and has a cut-vertex v. If $|V(B)| = 3$ then $B = F(x, y, 0)$, so we may assume that $|V(B)| \geq 4$ and the result is true for all bridges on fewer vertices. At least one of $\{x, v\}$ or $\{y, v\}$ is a 2-cut of G, but $\{x, v\}$ cannot be since $G - \{x, v\}$ has at most two components. Thus $xv \in E(G)$ and $\{y, v\}$ is a 2-cut of G with precisely three $\{y, v\}$ bridges, two of which, say B_1 and B_2, are contained in B. Suppose without loss of generality that B_1 contains the subpath of P from x to v. Then $P[V(B_1)]$ is a Hamiltonian path of B_1 and so by part (a), $B_1 = F(y, v, 0)$. $P[V(B_2)]$ is a path in B_2, starting at v and covering all vertices of B_2 except for y. By induction, $B_2 = F(y, v, k-1)$ for some $k - 1 \in \mathbb{N}_0$. It follows that $B = F(x, y, k)$.

□

It is easy to see that each $G_{i,j,k}$ has property Δ and contains a 3-leaf spanning tree. The following result shows that it is enough to only consider these graphs.

Lemma 3.2. *Let G be a graph with a 3-leaf spanning tree T. If G satisfies property Δ, then $P(G, t) = P(G_{i,j,k}, t)$ for some $i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}_0$.*

Proof. We show that G is Whitney equivalent to $G_{i,j,k}$ for some $i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. By the remark following Proposition 2.3, this implies the result. If G contains a Hamiltonian path then for any 2-cut $\{x, y\}$, one of the three $\{x, y\}$-bridges satisfies Lemma 3.1(a), whilst the other two satisfy Lemma 3.1(b). Thus G is Whitney equivalent to $G_{i,0,k}$ for some $i, k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and we are done.

Now we may assume that v is a vertex of degree 3 in T. We first find a useful 2-cut. Since G is not 3-connected, there is some cut set of size 2. Choose such a 2-cut $S = \{x, y\}$ so that the smallest S-bridge containing v is as small as possible. We claim that $v \in S$. If this is not the case then let B be the S-bridge containing v. Since B is separable there is some cut-vertex u of B. Also, since v has degree 3 in T, $|V(B)| \geq 4$. This implies that one of $\{x, u\}$ or $\{y, u\}$ is a smaller cut-set containing v, a contradiction. We now claim to be able to find a 2-cut S such that $v \in S$, and the three neighbours of v in T, denoted v_1, v_2 and v_3, lie in three different S-bridges. If this is not already the case, choose a 2-cut S such that $v \in S$, and the S-bridge containing two of v_1, v_2, v_3 is as small as possible. By a similar argument we find a 2-cut with the desired property.

Fix the 2-cut $S = \{x, y\}$ so that y has degree 3 in T. For $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, let B_i be an S-bridge, and $y_i \in V(B_i)$ be the neighbours of y in T. Finally for



Figure 2: Cases 1 and 2 in the proof of Lemma 3.2.

$i \in \{1,2,3\}$ we let P_i be the unique path in T from y to a leaf of T, which contains the vertex y_i. Suppose without loss of generality that x lies on P_2. We distinguish two cases.

Case 1: $V(P_2) = V(B_2)$**.**

P_1 and P_3 are paths in B_1 and B_3 respectively, which start at y and cover all vertices of B_1, B_3 except x. By Lemma 3.1(b), $B_1 = F(x,y,i)$ and $B_3 = F(x,y,k)$ for some $i,k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. If P_2 ends at x then Lemma 3.1(a) implies $B_2 = F(x,y,0)$ and by performing a Whitney 2-switch of B_3 about $\{x,y\}$ we are done. So suppose P_2 ends at some vertex z other than x. B_2 is separable and so there is a cut-vertex v of B_2. Since P contains a subpath connecting y and x, it follows that v lies between y and x on P. So let Q_1, Q_2 and Q_3 be the sub-paths of P_2 from y to v, v to x and x to z respectively. Now $G - \{y,v\}$ contains at most two components, and therefore Q_1 is the edge yv. Note that $|V(B)| \geq 4$, so $G - \{x,v\}$ contains at least two components. It follows from property Δ that G has precisely three $\{x,v\}$-bridges, two of which are contained in B_2. Let C_2 and C_3 be the $\{x,v\}$-bridges containing Q_2 and Q_3 respectively. Q_2 is a Hamiltonian path of C_2 from v to x. Thus by Lemma 3.1(a), $C_2 = F(x,v,0)$. Similarly C_3 contains a path starting at x and covering all vertices of C_3 except for v. By Lemma 3.1(b) it follows that $B_3 = F(v,x,j-1)$ for some $j-1 \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Now performing a Whitney 2-switch of C_3 with respect to $\{x,v\}$ gives a new graph, where the $\{x,y\}$-bridge corresponding to B_2 is $F(x,y,j)$. Finally, performing a Whitney 2-switch of B_3 about $\{x,y\}$ gives a graph isomorphic to $G_{i,j,k}$. This completes the proof.

Case 2: $V(P_2) \supset V(B_2)$**.**

Suppose without loss of generality that P_2 also contains vertices of $B_3 - x - y$. As before, Lemma 3.1(b) implies that $B_1 = F(x,y,i-1)$ for some $i-1 \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $B_2 = F(x,y,0)$ by Lemma 3.1(a). Now $T[V(B_3)]$ consists of two disjoint paths Q_1 and Q_2, starting at x and y respectively. Since B_3 is separable, there is a cut-vertex v. Suppose without loss of generality that $v \in V(Q_1)$.

If this is not the case we perform a Whitney 2-switch of B_3 with respect to $\{x, y\}$ and proceed similarly. Both Q_1 and Q_2 contain at least one edge, thus $|V(B_3)| \geq 4$ and at least one of $\{x, v\}$ and $\{y, v\}$ is a 2-cut of G. Suppose for a contradiction that $\{x, v\}$ is a 2-cut. $G - \{x, v\}$ has at least two components and so G has precisely three $\{x, v\}$-bridges, two of which are contained in B_3. Now $G - \{v, y\}$ can have at most two components and as such v is the unique neighbour of y in B_3. But $v \in V(Q_1)$ and therefore Q_2 is a single vertex. This contradicts the fact that Q_2 contains at least one edge.

So we may assume that $\{y, v\}$ is a 2-cut of G, and v is the unique neighbour of x in B_3. Now, as before, G has precisely three $\{v, y\}$-bridges, two of which are contained in B_3. Denote the two $\{v, y\}$-bridges which are contained in B_3 by C_1 and C_2, where Q_2 is contained in C_2. It is now easy to see that Q_2 is a path of C_2 starting at y and containing all vertices of C_2 except for v. Similarly, $Q_1[V(C_1)]$ is a path of C_1 starting at v and containing all vertices of C_1 except for y. Thus by Lemma 3.1(b), $C_1 = F(y, v, k)$ and $C_2 = F(v, y, j)$ for some $j, k \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Now consider the 2-cut $\{v, y\}$ of G. It has three bridges two of which are C_1 and C_2 found in B_3. The third $\{v, y\}$-bridge, denoted C_3, is composed of the edge xv and the two $\{x, y\}$-bridges, $F(x, y, 0)$ and $F(x, y, i-1)$ of G. By performing a Whitney 2-switch of $F(x, y, i-1)$ at $\{x, y\}$, we get a new graph G', where the $\{v, y\}$-bridge of G' corresponding to C_3 is precisely $F(v, y, i)$. Now G' is isomorphic to $G_{i,j,k}$ and so $P(G, t) = P(G_{i,j,k}, t)$. This completes the proof. □

3.1 A Zero Free Interval for $P(G_{i,j,k}, t)$

We now determine the behaviour of the chromatic roots of each $G_{i,j,k}$. Here t_0 is the real number defined in Theorem 1.1 and $\mathcal{H} = \{H_i : i \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ is the family of graphs defined in Section 2.1. It is easily seen that $G_{i,0,k} = H_{i+k+2}$. If $j = 1$ then by adding and contracting the edge from x to the cut vertex of $F(x, y, j)$ we find that

$$P(G_{i,1,k}, t) = (t-2)^2 P(H_{i+k+2}, t) + \frac{(t-1)}{t} P(H_{i+1}, t) P(H_k, t).$$

Finally if $j \geq 2$ then using Proposition 2.1 and 2.2 gives the recurrence

$$P(G_{i,j,k}, t) = (t-2)^2 P(G_{i,j-1,k}, t) + (t-1)^2 (t-2) P(G_{i,j-2,k}, t).$$

Solving this explicitly for fixed $t \in (1, t_0]$ gives a solution of the form $P(G_{i,j,k}, t) = C\alpha^j + D\beta^j$ where C and D are constants depending on i, k and

t. Recall α and β are defined in (3). The initial conditions corresponding to $j = 0, 1$ are

$$C + D = P(H_{i+k+2}, t) \tag{6}$$

$$C\alpha + D\beta = (t-2)^2 P(H_{i+k+2}, t) + \frac{t-1}{t} P(H_{i+1}, t) P(H_k, t). \tag{7}$$

Multiplying (6) by β and subtracting the resulting equation from (7) gives

$$\begin{aligned} C(\alpha - \beta) &= ((t-2)^2 - \beta) P(H_{i+k+2}, t) + \frac{t-1}{t} P(H_{i+1}, t) P(H_k, t) \\ &= \alpha P(H_{i+k+2}, t) + \frac{t-1}{t} P(H_{i+1}, t) P(H_k, t). \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

For convenience we define $\gamma = \gamma(t) = \alpha t/(t-1) > 0$, for $t \in (1, t_0]$. Let t_1 be the smallest real root of the polynomial $(t-2)^6 + 4(t-1)^2(t-2)^3 - (t-1)^4$. We claim that for $t \in (1, t_1]$

$$\gamma\beta < -A \leq \gamma\alpha. \tag{9}$$

The left inequality follows since $\gamma\beta = -t(t-1)(t-2)$ and so by (4), $-A - \gamma\beta = B > 0$. The right side follows since for $t \in (1, t_0]$

$$\begin{array}{rrcl} & -A & \leq & \gamma\alpha \\ \iff & -\frac{1}{\delta} t(t-1)((t-2)\alpha + (t-1)^2) & \leq & \frac{t}{t-1}(t-2)((t-2)\alpha + (t-1)^2) \\ \iff & -(t-1)^2 & \geq & (t-2)\delta \\ \iff & (t-1)^4 & \leq & (t-2)^2\delta^2. \end{array}$$

Using (2), the final inequality is seen to be satisfied when the aforementioned polynomial is non-negative.

Since each $H \in \mathcal{H}$ has an odd number of vertices, Theorem 1.1 implies $P(H, t) < 0$ for $t \in (1, t_0]$. It now follows that (8), and hence C, are negative if

$$\gamma |P(H_{i+j+2}, t)| > P(H_{i+1}, t) P(H_k, t).$$

Indeed for $t \in (1, t_1]$, we have that $0 < \beta < \alpha < 1$ and $0 < B < -A < 1$, which together with (1) and (9) implies

$$\begin{aligned} P(H_{i+1}, t) P(H_k, t) &= (A\alpha^{i+1} + B\beta^{i+1})(A\alpha^k + B\beta^k) \\ &= A^2\alpha^{i+k+1} + AB\alpha^{i+1}\beta^k + AB\alpha^k\beta^{i+1} + B^2\beta^{i+k+1} \\ &< -A\gamma\alpha^{i+k+2} - B^2\beta^{i+k+1} - B\gamma\beta^{i+k+2} + B^2\beta^{i+k+1} \\ &= \gamma(-A\alpha^{i+k+2} - B\beta^{i+k+2}) = \gamma |P(H_{i+k+2}, t)|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $C < 0$, (6) implies $D < -C$. Finally, since $\alpha > \beta$, we may conclude that $P(G_{i,j,k}, t) < 0$ for $t \in (1, t_1]$.

Now suppose that $t \in (t_1, t_0)$ is fixed. Then $-A > \gamma\alpha$. Setting $i+1 = k$ for simplicity we see that

$$\frac{P(H_k,t)^2}{\gamma|P(H_{2k+1},t)|} = \frac{A^2\alpha^{2k} + 2AB\alpha^k\beta^k + B^2\beta^{2k}}{\gamma(-A\alpha^{2k+1} - B\beta^{2k+1})} \longrightarrow \frac{A^2}{-\gamma A\alpha} = \frac{-A}{\gamma\alpha} > 1.$$

as $k \to \infty$. Thus, for large enough i and k, $\gamma|P(H_{i+k+2},t)| < P(H_{i+1},t)P(H_k,t)$ and hence C is positive. Though (6) implies that D is negative, since $\alpha > \beta$ it follows that for large enough j, $P(G_{i,j,k},t) > 0$. Since we have proven that $P(G_{i,j,k},t) < 0$ on $(1,t_1]$, we may conclude by continuity that $P(G_{i,j,k},t)$ has a root in (t_1,t).

4 Main Result

To prove Theorem 1.2 we shall show that a smallest counterexample has property Δ. In [4], Dong and Koh extracted the essence of the proofs of Thomassen [7] and Jackson [5] and gave a general method to do this. An important part of that method is the following definition and lemma.

Definition 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a family of graphs. $\mathcal{G}$ is called splitting-closed if the following conditions hold for each $G \in \mathcal{G}$.*

- *For every complete cut-set C with $|C| \leq 2$, all C-bridges of G are in $\mathcal{G}$.*

- *For every 2-cut $\{x,y\}$ such that $xy \notin E(G)$, and every $\{x,y\}$-bridge B, the graphs $B+xy$ and B/xy are in $\mathcal{G}$.*

It is straightforward to check that the family of non-separable graphs with a 3-leaf spanning tree is splitting-closed. In fact $\mathcal{G}_k$ is splitting-closed for all $k \geq 2$.

Lemma 4.1. *(Adapted from [4]) Let G be a non-separable graph and $\{x,y\}$ be a 2-cut of G with $\{x,y\}$-bridges $B_1,\ldots,B_m$ where m is odd. For fixed $i,j \in [m]$, let $B_{i,j}$ be the graph formed from $B_i \cup B_j$ by adding a new vertex w and the edges xw and wy. Let $B_\cup = \cup_{k\in[m]\setminus\{i,j\}} B_k$. For fixed $t \in (1,2)$, if $Q(B_\cup,t)$, $Q(B_{i,j},t)$, $Q(B_k+xy,t)$, $Q(B_k/xy,t)$ are positive for each $k \in [m]\setminus\{i,j\}$, then $Q(G,t) > 0$.*

The proof of Lemma 4.1 is a straightforward modification of the proof of Lemma 2.5 in [4]. We now prove the main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let G be a smallest counterexample to the theorem and let $t \in (1, t_1]$ such that $Q(G,t) \leq 0$. We show that G has property Δ and hence by Lemma 3.2, $P(G,t) = P(G_{i,j,k},t)$ for some $i,j,k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Since no $G_{i,j,k}$ has a root less than or equal to t_1, a contradiction ensues.

By the hypotheses, G is non-separable.

Claim 1: G is not 3-connected.

If G is 3-connected then $G-e$ and G/e are non-separable for every edge $e \in E(G)$. So let v be a leaf of T, and e be an edge incident to v but not in T. Then also $G-e$ and G/e have a 3-leaf spanning tree. By Proposition 2.1 it follows that G is not a smallest counterexample. This is a contradiction.

In what follows let $\{x,y\}$ be an arbitrary 2-cut with $\{x,y\}$-bridges $B_1,\ldots,B_m$.

Claim 2: For every 2-cut $\{x,y\}$, $xy \notin E(G)$.

Suppose $xy \in E(G)$. By Proposition 2.2,

$$Q(G,t) = \frac{Q(B_1,t)Q(B_2,t)\cdots Q(B_m,t)}{t^{m-1}(t-1)^{m-1}}.$$

Since G is a smallest counterexample and $\mathcal{G}_3$ is splitting-closed, $Q(B_i,t) > 0$ for $i \in [m]$. A contradiction follows.

Claim 3: All 2-cuts have precisely three bridges.

Suppose m is even, then

$$\begin{aligned} Q(G,t) &= Q(G+xy,t) - Q(G/xy,t) \\ &= \frac{Q(B_1+xy,t)\cdots Q(B_m+xy,t)}{t^{m-1}(t-1)^{m-1}} + \frac{Q(B_1/xy,t)\cdots Q(B_m/xy,t)}{t^{m-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since G is a smallest counterexample and $\mathcal{G}_3$ is splitting-closed, all terms in the final expression are positive and so $Q(G,t) > 0$, a contradiction. Thus m is odd. If $m \geq 5$, choose two bridges B_i and B_j for which $T[V(B_i)]$ and $T[V(B_j)]$ are disconnected and form the graphs $B_{i,j}$ and $B_\cup$ as described in Lemma 4.1. Clearly $B_{i,j}$ and $B_\cup$ are non-separable and have a 3-leaf spanning tree. The same is true for all $B_k + xy$, B_k/xy, $k \in [m] \setminus \{i,j\}$ since $\mathcal{G}_3$ is splitting-closed. Since each of these graphs is smaller than G, the conditions of Lemma 4.1 are satisfied and thus $Q(G,t) > 0$, a contradiction.

Claim 4: If $\{x,y\}$ is a 2-cut, then every $\{x,y\}$-bridge is separable.

Let B be an arbitrary $\{x,y\}$-bridge, say $B = B_1$, and suppose for a contradiction that B is non-separable. Since $xy \notin E(G)$, $|V(B)| \geq 4$. We may assume that B contains at most two leaves of T, since if T has three leaves in B, then $G - \{x,y\}$ has at most two components. Relabelling x and y if necessary there are four cases how $T[V(B)]$ may behave:

Case 1: $T[V(B)]$ is connected.



Figure 3: Case 3a of Claim 4.

Case 2: $T[V(B)]$ consists of an isolated vertex x and a path starting at y and covering all vertices of $B - x$.

Case 3: $T[V(B)]$ consists of an isolated vertex x and a tree with precisely three leaves, one of which is y, covering all vertices of $B - x$.

Case 4: $T[V(B)]$ consists of two disjoint paths starting at x and y respectively and covering all vertices of B.

In Case 1, $T[V(B)]$ is a 3-leaf spanning tree of B. In Case 2 adding any edge of B incident with x to T also shows that B contains such a spanning tree. Thus in these two cases, $B, B + xy$, and B/xy are members of $\mathcal{G}_3$. As G is a smallest counterexample we may apply Lemma 4.1 with $i = 2, j = 3$ which gives $Q(G, t) > 0$, a contradiction.

Two cases remain.

Case 3: $T[V(B)]$ consists of an isolated vertex x and a tree with precisely three leaves, one of which is y, covering all vertices of $B - x$.

Let v be the vertex of degree 3 in T and T_1 be the path in T from y to v.

Subcase 3a: $B - x$ is separable.

Since $|V(B)| \geq 4$, there is a cut-vertex z of $B - x$. So $\{x, z\}$ is a 2-cut of B and a 2-cut of G. By Claim 3, G has precisely three $\{x, z\}$-bridges, two of which are contained in B. This implies that $v = z$ and T_1 is a Hamiltonian path of the unique $\{z\}$-bridge of $B - x$ which contains y (see Figure 3). Since B is non-separable, $V(T_1) \geq 3$ and x has a neighbour in $V(T_1) \setminus \{y, z\}$. Choose such a neighbour, x', from which the distance to y on T_1 is minimal. It is easy to see that G contains two paths from x to x' avoiding the edge xx' itself. Thus $G - xx'$ is non-separable and has a 3-leaf spanning tree. By Claim 2, G/xx' is also non-separable. Now Proposition 2.1 gives

$$Q(G,t) = Q(G - xx', t) + Q(G/xx', t). \tag{10}$$

Since G is a smallest counterexample, $Q(G - xx', t) > 0$. Thus we have reached a contradiction if $Q(G/xx', t) > 0$. This follows immediately if G/xx' has a 3-leaf spanning tree. Otherwise $|V(B/xx')| \geq 4$, and so we apply Lemma 4.1 to G/xx' with $i = 2$ and $j = 3$. To see that the hypotheses hold we show that all of the graphs B/xx', $B/xx' + xy$ and $B/xx'/xy$ are non-separable and have a 3-leaf spanning tree. That they contain such a spanning tree is clear. Also $B/xx' + xy$ is non-separable since G/xx' is non-separable. Finally, if B/xx' or $B/xx'/xy$ is separable, then $B - \{x, x'\}$ or $B - \{x, x', y\}$ is disconnected. By the choice of x', this implies $\{x', y\}$ is a 2-cut of G with two $\{x', y\}$-bridges, a contradiction to Claim 3.

Subcase 3b: $B - x$ is non-separable.
Since $|V(B)| \geq 4$, $G - e$ is non-separable for every edge $e \in E(B)$ incident to x. Choose a neighbour, x' of x, such that the distance on $T[V(B)]$ from v to x' is maximal. Since B is non-separable, x has at least two neighbours in B and so $x' \neq v$. By Claim 2 and the above, both $G - xx'$ and G/xx' are non-separable. Furthermore $G - xx'$ has a 3-leaf spanning tree. As before, by (10), we have reached a contradiction if $Q(G/xx') > 0$. This follows immediately if G/xx' has a 3-leaf spanning tree. Otherwise we apply Lemma 4.1 to G/xx' as in Case 3a. The same argument shows that the hypotheses hold.

Case 4: Suppose that $T[V(B)]$ consists of two paths P_1 and P_2, starting at x and y respectively, and covering all vertices of B.
Let $P_1 = x_1, \ldots, x_{n_1}$ and $P_2 = y_1, \ldots, y_{n_2}$ where $x = x_1$ and $y = y_1$. If x or x_{n_1} has a neighbour x' on P_2, then B contains a 3-leaf spanning tree. As in Cases 1 and 2, this is enough to reach a contradiction. Thus $|V(P_1)| \geq 4$ and all neighbours of x_{n_1} lie on P_1. Apart from its predecessor on P_1, x_{n_1} has at least one other neighbour since B is non-separable. If x_{n_1} has at least two other neighbours, say x_i, x_j with $i < j$, then $G - x_{n_1}x_i$ and $G/x_{n_1}x_i$ are non-separable and have a 3-leaf spanning tree. By Proposition 2.1 we again reach a contradiction. So we may suppose that $d(x_{n_1}) = 2$ and $N(x_{n_1}) = \{x_{n_1-1}, x_i\}$. It follows that $\{x_i, x_{n_1-1}\}$ is a 2-cut of G. Thus G has precisely three $\{x_i, x_{n_1-1}\}$-bridges, of which one contains the subpath $P_1[x_i, x_{n_1-1}]$. Call this bridge B_4. Note also that there is some edge e from x_{n_1-1} to the $\{x_i, x_{n_1-1}\}$-bridge of G containing y. Since $T[V(B_4)]$ is a Hamiltonian path of B_4, it follows from Case 1 that B_4 is separable. Thus it has a cut vertex v. Because of the edges e and $x_i x_{n_1}$, we see that $G - \{x_i, v\}$ and $G - \{x_{n_1-1}, v\}$ both have at most two components. From Claim 3 it follows that neither of $\{x_i, v\}$ and $\{x_{n_1-1}, v\}$ are cut-sets of G. Thus B_4 is a path of length 2, $i = n_1 - 3$, and $d(x_{n_1-2}) = 2$. We conclude that there is at least one vertex



Figure 4: If $w \in V(P_1)$.

of degree 2 on the interior of P_1.

Now let $x_j \in V(P_1) \setminus \{x_1, x_{n_1}\}$ be a vertex of degree 2 with j as small as possible. Then $\{x_{j-1}, x_{j+1}\}$ is a 2-cut and G contains precisely three $\{x_{j-1}, x_{j+1}\}$-bridges. Since each of x_{j-1} and x_{j+1} has a neighbour in each $\{x_{j-1}, x_{j+1}\}$-bridge, there is some edge e from x_{j-1} to one of $x_{j+2}, x_{j+3}, \ldots, x_{n_1}$. Now consider the $\{x_{j-1}, x_{j+1}\}$-bridge, B_y, containing y. This bridge contains a 3-leaf spanning tree covering all of its vertices apart from x_{j+1}. By Case 3, it is separable and has a cut-vertex w. It is easy to see that w must lie on $P_1[x, x_{j-2}]$ or P_2. Suppose the former (see Figure 4). Since $|V(B_y)| \geq 4$ at least one of $\{x_{j-1}, w\}$ or $\{x_{j+1}, w\}$ is a 2-cut of G. However, because of the edge e and the presence of a path from x to y in another $\{x, y\}$-bridge (indicated in Figure 4), $G - \{x_{j+1}, w\}$ has at most two components. Therefore $\{x_{j-1}, w\}$ is a 2-cut of G and as such gives rise to three $\{x_{j-1}, w\}$-bridges, one of which contains the path $P_1[w, x_{j-1}]$. This path has length at least 2 by Claim 2. By the argument above, $w = x_{j-3}$ and $d(x_{j-2}) = 2$, contradicting the minimality of j.

So w lies on P_2 (see Figure 5). Once again at least one of $\{x_{j-1}, w\}$ or $\{x_{j+1}, w\}$ is a 2-cut of G, but $\{x_{j+1}, w\}$ cannot be since $G - \{x_{j+1}, w\}$ has at most two components. It follows that wx_{j+1} is an edge and $\{x_{j-1}, w\}$ is a 2-cut with precisely three bridges. Let B_5 be the $\{x_{j-1}, w\}$-bridge containing the vertex y_{n_2}, then $P_2[w, y_{n_2}]$ is a path of B_5 covering all vertices except x_{j-1}. By Case 2, B_5 is separable and has a cut vertex z on $P_2[w, y_{n_2}]$. Because of the edge wx_{j+1}, $G - \{x_{j-1}, z\}$ has at most two components. Therefore $\{x_{j-1}, z\}$ is not a 2-cut and zx_{j-1} is an edge.

Finally note that $x_{j-1} \neq x$ and $w \neq y$ or else B would contain a 3-leaf spanning tree. Consider the $\{x_{j-1}, w\}$-bridge B_6 containing x and y. $T[V(B_6)]$ is connected so by Case 1, B_6 is separable and has a cut vertex z'. Since $|V(B_6)| \geq 4$, at least one of $\{x_{j-1}, z'\}$ and $\{w, z'\}$ is a 2-cut of G.



Figure 5: If $w \in V(P_2)$.

However because of the edges zx_{j-1} and wx_{j+1}, both $G - \{x_{j-1}, z'\}$ and $G - \{w, z'\}$ have at most two components. This gives the final contradiction. □

5 Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Martin Merker and Carsten Thomassen for helpful discussions. This research was supported by ERC Advanced Grant GRACOL, project number 320812.

References

[1] D. Barnette. Trees in polyhedral graphs. *Canad. J. Math.*, 18:731–736, 1966.

[2] G. D. Birkhoff. A determinant formula for the number of ways of coloring a map. *Ann. of Math.*, 14(1):42–46, 1912.

[3] F. M. Dong and B. Jackson. A zero-free interval for chromatic polynomials of nearly 3-connected plane graphs. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 25(3):1103–1118, 2011.

[4] F. M. Dong and K. M. Koh. Domination numbers and zeros of chromatic polynomials. *Discrete Math.*, 308(10):1930–1940, 2008.

[5] B. Jackson. A zero-free interval for chromatic polynomials of graphs. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 2:325–336, 1993.

[6] C. Thomassen. The zero-free intervals for chromatic polynomials of graphs. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 6:497–506, 1997.

[7] C. Thomassen. Chromatic roots and hamiltonian paths. *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. B*, 80(2):218–224, 2000.

[8] W. T. Tutte. Chromials. In Claude Berge and Dijen Ray-Chaudhuri, editors, *Hypergraph Seminar*, volume 411 of *Lect. Notes in Math.*, pages 243–266. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1974.

[9] H. Whitney. The coloring of graphs. *Ann. of Math.*, 33(4):688–718, 1932.

[10] H. Whitney. A logical expansion in mathematics. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 38(8):572–579, 1932.